The
COMMONWEAL

VOLUME XLIII January 25, 1946 NUMBER 15

THE WEEK 371
WHAT LANGUAGE? *Philip Burnham* 373
CATHOLICS AND POLITICS IN CHILE *Alfonso Santa Cruz* 375
THE ANATOMY OF DEPRESSION *George Doherty* 377
COMMUNICATIONS 381
THE SCREEN *Philip T. Hartung* 382
THE OPERA SEASON *Chester Kallman* 383
HEARD MELODIES *Anne Fremantle* 384
MORE BOOKS OF THE WEEK 387
Trends in Collective Bargaining—For Thee the Best—United for Freedom—The Art of Newman's Apologia—Pursuit of Understanding—Beach Red—The Glass Crutch—What the Informed Citizen Needs to Know

THE COMMONWEAL *is indexed in the Reader's Guide, Catholic Periodical Index and Catholic Bookman. Founded by the Calvert Associates, Inc., in 1924, with Michael Williams as President and Editor.*

Published weekly and copyrighted 1946 in the U. S. A. by The Commonweal Publishing Co., Inc., 386 Fourth Avenue, New York 16, N. Y. AShland 4-9685. Entered as second class matter February 9, 1934 as the post office at New York, N. Y., under the act of March 3, 1879. U.S. $5 a year, Canada and Foreign $6. Single copies 10c.

Editors: EDWARD SKILLIN, JR.
PHILIP BURNHAM
HARRY LORIN BINSSE, *Managing Editor;* C. G. PAULDING, *Literary Editor;* JOHN C. CORT, *Associate Editor;* JOHN BRUBAKER, *Advertising Manager.*

Prospect for Germany

FEW Americans have been foolish enough to claim that the re-orientation of Germany would constitute a simple problem. There has been all along considerable disagreement as to feasible methods. What was widely accepted were certain ultimate aims. Foremost of these was to create—or seek that which would lead the Germans to create—a Germany which would live in abiding peace with its neighbors.

The press has made much of the difference in approach in the Russian and Anglo-American zones. Each policy reflects certain basic beliefs of the occupying powers. The Soviets utilize those economic and social institutions which express their own Marxian political ideal; we endeavor, primarily through educational means, to engender democratic aspirations which will give birth to a new political system more in line with our own social principles. An interesting contrast.

But what the American press is neglecting to a deplorably large extent is our immediate policy in dealing with the individual German. It is not even necessary here to be convinced that the theory of collective guilt is untenable to see where our present policy is leading.

As a punishment Germans are being isolated from the rest of the world. They cannot write or hear from their friends or families in other countries. The UNRRA teams are in Germany, but for the purpose of aiding displaced persons not Germans. No private relief agencies are allowed to enter the country to administer relief in Germany, nor are food packages permitted to be sent there by anyone. In this manner one of the most effective means of breaking the hermetic seal on information imposed by the Nazis and largely protracted by our forces is circumvented. If we have any hope that the Germans will develop genuinely democratic sentiments, we must, on the contrary, give them every possible contact with their friends and relatives outside—who for the most part are of a strongly democratic persuasion.

That is not the worst of it. Together with the policy of insulation from the outside world goes a policy of economic stagnation and near, if not actual, starvation. Conditions in Germany are so bad that thirty-four Senators have made a special plea to the President to increase the daily ration and to let food packages and relief workers go through. All to no avail thus far.

Lack of food in Germany is hardly surprising. A good summary of the situation is provided by Karl Brandt of Stanford University in a pamphlet just published by *Human Events*. Here are a few leading factors. Some twelve million Germans have been forcibly evicted (by the Czechs, Russians, Poles etc.) into a devastated land where food, shelter and fuel were already at a premium. And when fuel is lacking, as it is in Germany, the human body needs more food calories for survival. Normally, the territory which Germany has lost east of the Oder and Niesse Rivers provided one quarter of that nation's food supply. To aggravate things the dismantling of industry called for by the Potsdam agreement included plants producing fertilizer and agricultural machinery. In view of all this—and the transportation breakdown—the food ration in a number of German cities has fallen to 800 calories, or one half what is required for subsistence.

Do we really expect that occupation forces operating under such conditions can achieve the admittedly difficult task of making good democrats and friendly neighbors out of the Germans? Particularly when all this is coupled with a flat pronouncement that our objective is to reduce the German standard of living to a level 25 percent below what it was a decade ago.

Americans have never been very good at learning from history and our memories are short. We forget that the prolongation of the blockade after the last war produced a generation of Germans warped in spirit. We forget that Hitler rose to a position from which he could seize power through the desperation of an impoverished people without hope. We even forget that atomic and bacterial weapons make it possible for a nation with any scientific aptitude much more

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quickly to reach a position to threaten the peace of the whole world. In our vindictiveness, lethargy and shortsightedness we have, alas, forgotten our main objective.

The GI Revolt

TWO things we feel quite sure about the local stories of demonstrations in the Army overseas are first that we at home do not get an adequate and clear picture of what it would seem like if we were there, and second, that the great bulk of the soldiers engaging in the more or less amiable mutinies have no over-all, commonly accepted social, economic, political or military program deliberately and conclusively worked out in their mind—not even coming back home as quick as it is physically possible, regardless.

We also feel pretty sure that if we were abroad as enlisted men, we would also be suffering from the common aching back and plethora of occupational gripes and would be joining in some of the boos and hisses. If we were officers abroad, for much the same and for other reasons, we would likely be just as tough as higher echelons would permit about reasserting discipline and meting out punishments for these inexcusable lapses.

You have to criticize just about everything about America to criticize adequately this display by our armed forces, and that includes ourselves as we said above. Beginning from the ground up, the Army was at no point noted for very alert, smart, willing or "military" discipline. That was and is a fault of the privates, of the non-coms, of the officers, and of the whole principle, theory and practice of the American military establishment. It's lucky it didn't cause more trouble earlier. The demagogic line taken by the highest authorities now shows there is nothing special about the rank and file who are kicking. The second most direct complaint about the situation naturally goes against "Washington"—whoever is supposed to formulate an intelligible policy which involves the armed forces, particularly foreign policy. The State Department have been apologizing so long to so many people that it is inevitable the men held abroad would insist upon their bit of apology fairly soon. Third, but really quite a way removed when the realities of national policy are considered, the general citizenry must be blamed for failing to develop and enforce an international and national policy for the people, including distant sons.

It does for certain seem to be time that something were done: a negative policy has positive, and nearly always positively bad, content when it is pursued long enough. The mess with the Army, with the draft, with foreign policy, furnish, it is everywhere demonstrated, a perfect ramp for the Communist, USSR line. Home CP and fellow-traveling sheets offer an abundance of slogans for orientating the protest, and no sane man doubts that to the extent they can, the Communists are working abroad into the Army and Navy to push the same line of withdrawal, without further thought, from interest or power in the spheres of most immediate interest to the Soviet Union. Whatever policy comes, it ought not come through ungovernable mess nor through minority, communist unwanted pressure.

It is doubtful if many foreign countries will be able to grasp a peculiar but veritable aspect of these demonstrations: They testify to the almost insolent strength of the United States. The people are not much upset, Congress is not rabidly concerned, the Executive is unhysterical, even the management of the Army itself is decidedly calm about these little, as it were, mutinies here and there around the world. For a few years at least, however sloppy we may look, there is nothing to challenge the power of the United States really seriously on any continent or sea.

UNO in London

THERE are probably people who read every word that is printed in the newspapers about the opening meeting of the UNO in London and just as when the UNO was being planned in San Francisco, there are people who will see a crisis, a battle, a victory, a defeat, in whatever happens every day. The newspapers will do what they can to make things look exciting—whenever a Russian says what he wants, or even when no one says what he wants because there is just confusion—and there may be real excitement in what goes on anyway. There was excitement in what went on years ago in Geneva when the League of Nations started out with everyone hoping in it and the excitement grew undoubtedly more intense when, after a while, it became obvious that the League was failing. But the League was not organized for the purpose of providing excitement for intellectuals in between the exciting fireworks of two wars and the UNO in London is not there for that purpose either.

The UNO may be in London as a screen for the Big Three—the three great words: England, Russia, America, with all the power and vitality they represent—but also it may be in London (or Princeton or Hyde Park) as a possible instrument through which an international order may be instituted.

It can be a screen for power politics; it can be an instrument through which the power of every nation's will for peace can be applied to the politics that make peace or war. It is an instrument, and nothing more than an instrument. Even as an instrument it has certain defects—repeatedly we have pointed them out: the veto power for instance—which make it the sort of tool that is hard to work with. But it is not some-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thing we have bought and which the shop will not change; it can be tested and mended and amended until the countries can work with it and make it carve out the clean figure of justice.

That is, if they really want to make any statue at all, any figure that men all over the world can look at recognizing that it stands there symbolizing not their desire for peace but their never ending insistence on maintaining peace in justice.

There might have been other ways, instruments, but when the war was over nothing but the UNO was discovered. There were other ways of course by which certain nations could work to maintain peace for themselves but they were extremely hazardous. America could work for peace by constructing more atomic bombs than anyone else or by utilizing the even more promising results of intensive bacteriological research conducted during the war. America could hope to frighten all the nations of the world into peace. But that hope was inseparable from its probable effect: that all nations would unite against America—and there was also the idea that perhaps in some of them there might be scientists who would be able to do something with the atom and with bacteria. The idea of each nation working for peace all by itself does not seem promising. We hope it has been forever abandoned. The immediate path toward peace lies through the UNO.

What Language?

THAT was a remarkable precept of politeness which barred from the conversation of ladies and gentlemen reference to religion and politics. Well brought up people could stay young in spirit, very youthful indeed, in mind, by following the rule and avoiding those principal but trying interests of the wider world. Avoiding words, ideas and emotions might be abolished from the region of chosen family contacts, and, increasingly, in all consciousness. A man dealt with the "politics" necessary for his economic power only as a small branch of his "business," a shady and indelicate part, a "dirty game" played with men his wife didn't know. And religion—where did it retreat, boned and bled and veiled by embarrassment? Human relationships were cultivated like a new kind of fruit, bland and seedless and with no tough core, free from common interests in Grace and mystery and belief and the way things are, without concern for the objective morality which leads rudely and inescapably to consideration of the social order and politics.

Strength of the social tabus has weakened and it is hard to be too impolite. Even the Book-of-the-Month Club, bidding for a mass, bourgeois market, can send around—with suitable apologies, to be sure—a novel with characters who recognize sin, talk of the crucifixion and are terribly pursued by the grace of God. Proper appreciation of currently celebrated political correspondents and columnists was recently expected in genuinely exalted salons. It appears to be a fairly anarchic time, to be sure, and what the rules are right now, I don't know.

It does look as though the period of settled conventions governing these matters has passed, but just as it passes the particular instances when it proves simply impossible for people to talk together about religion and politics are increasing. The returned-from-abroad problem is one reason. The speed-up of the unresolved revolution during the war, obscured by the war and now growing imposingly evident, is a reason. Other reasons, historical, psychological, political and religious, can be supplied.

Taking as a fact the difficulties now of talking agreeably, patiently, understandingly, usefully with many people about those basic interests of life, are there any ways to know what is the right of it, what is the wrong? An article in the December issue of *Politics* by Will Herberg does more toward setting up a language to use talking over the subject than any I have seen since coming back home.

> Every historical period [Mr. Herberg begins] has its characteristic problem which sets its mark on all phases of social life and endows all social issues with their measure of relevance. At one time, it was the problem of religious unity; at another, the problem of nationalism; at still another, the "labor" problem. Many of the older problems still persist, of course, but they are no longer central. The central problem of today is the problem of totalitarianism.

That statement, commencing an article on "Personalism against Totalitarianism" appears to be right. Conversation about politics and religion which does not recognize this problem is irrelevant: it is dull and uninteresting or it is too annoying for long patience. You had better talk about sports and weather, entertainment and gossip, and perhaps you better keep a rifle over the fireplace.

The Herberg article continues to sound correct to a certain kind of Catholic ear while it defines and traces the historical hardening of the totalitarian issue:

> For our present purposes it is enough to define totalitarianism as a social philosophy that asserts the state to be identical with society and denies autonomy to individuals and non-state social groups. . . . It was with the break up of the medieval order that the first component of modern totalitarianism emerged—the absolute unitary state . . . the absolutism of the state became a popular absolutism and modern mass-democracy emerged. Its prophet was Rousseau. . . . Some time during the past century, mass-democracy became explicitly collectivist, thus fulfilling its immanent tendency. . . . Collectivism of the modern type is much more than a form of organization or an economic device. It is a veritable religion. . . . The real problem . . . is . . . not is a collective economy possible but is a *democratic* collective economy possible? . . . from the Judaeo-Christian standpoint, totalitarian religion in whatever form is a monstrous idolatry, for it exalts the collectivity, "the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> work of man's hands," into a god for his worship. . . . Fundamentally, only the personalist *mystique* of vital religion can supply the spiritual resources to resist totalitarian diabolism.

There can be genuine political and religious conversation with people who hold these views. How can there be anything like it with dogmatists who refuse to admit that collectivism involves any significant problem of totalitarianism? How can we talk with another dogmatist who is unconscious that there is in fact a "sweeping collectivist current," or who refuses to recognize that some men caught in that current are yet opposed with a fundamental fervor to totalitarianism? How can you protect civility talking about politics to someone who long ago finally concluded that anybody who is skeptical toward collectivism must favor, in a mysterious and wonderful way, the imposition of totalitarian tyranny ? It is easiest to meet such people when the baseball season is on or when the weather is really unusual. "The central problem of today" must be avoided, which avoidance, fortunately, is no great trial and, while it limits community of mind, does not prevent a very happy sort of friendly contact.

With persons taking Will Herberg's "new road in politics," it would be most agreeable to conduct extended fights along genuine ideological lines. The quotations strung together above do not contain the only force of his article, because they are selected to bring a meeting of interest and sympathy. They sound much more routine and ordinarily orthodox than the full article. But if such a basis of interest and definition can be relied upon, we would welcome also a definition of differences. And somebody might convince somebody of something and a bit of civil peace might conceivably be engendered.

I will start out by saying that the use made in the article of quotations from Karl Marx made me less antagonistic to the old master than before reading them, and so, perhaps, more understanding of contemporary Social Democrats, and of sport Socialists like those of *Politics*.

I will try to sum up my most generalized query in this way: Mr. Herberg appears in a way unscientific, fetishistic, and a bit too angelic. He lists objections to totalitarianism and points out how true it is that "economic collectivism in its very nature generates a powerful totalitarian potential," and in the midst he writes, "It is on such grounds that personalists advocate socialism." Then a kind of "socialism" is lightly sketched, principally from Lewis Corey and Berdyaev, which embodies "a pluralist economy," "a combination," "decentralization," "unalterably opposed to the extension of the collectivist spirit to other levels [than the economic]."

It seems to me to make the word socialist a fetish when a pluralist, personalist régime is given that name. The problem of nomenclature doesn't bother this reader, however, unless it involves something more, but it looks as though it might. Mr. Herberg seems to me to put too much faith in "undeviating adherence" to "a higher and more complete individualism." He considers it a gruesome "trick" of history that history took over "the organizational structure of Continental socialism to serve as the pattern for the totalitarian state." The processes of this trick, he writes, "were altogether unconscious," one of "the tragic ironies." But history I don't think plays tricks. Unconsciousness is no defense for Marxists. Many Christians were pointing out the consequences. There was even a Syllabus of Errors. The Socialists ought not plead ignorance of the law. And the Christians likewise must accept blame because they failed to reach the Socialists; they failed to develop a language both sides could speak with sympathy and comprehension: they failed to react to what proved to be the central social problem of their times.

Now Mr. Herberg notes the tendency of economic collectivism to generate totalitarianism, but he advocates pushing collectivism economically while holding it back at "other levels" by good resolution. His own evidence is against the expectation of success. His emphasis on pluralism and mixed economy indicates a sensible reluctance to take the chance. As a proposition to be considered, isn't it possible that directing the collectivist current into democratic channels might prove quite as difficult a job as breaking that current up into a plurality of less overwhelming floods that could more readily be used for the cultivation and irrigation of a genuinely humane landscape? Collectivism as well as socialism appear to be some kind of fetish.

There are an almost indefinite number of questions to ask, but one more inevitably comes up in an orthodox imagination, and it is intimately related to that resolution noted above to fight with the armor of ideal purpose and good will aberrations of collectivism which, on the evidence of history and logic, fosters through inherent material and objective means a tyrannous totalitarianism. No one would rule out hope and good will; rather, they should be supported by the establishment of favoring circumstances and environment. So also, "the personalist *mystique* of vital religion" which alone "can supply the spiritual resources": a vital religion cannot endure without Faith and Dogma, as well as *"mystique."* People do, in fact, I know, but just why they do, I don't quite know—worry about totalitarianism and a "higher and more complete individualism" unless prior to that concern they believe and seek a true link with God in heaven. At length, personalism depends upon the Church.

PHILIP BURNHAM.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Catholics and Politics in Chile

The development of another Christian democratic party

Alfonso Santa Cruz

IN THE history of Latin America Chile has distinguished herself by establishing genuine political stability at an early date. Since the Constitution of 1833 was promulgated there has been almost without interruption a legal and democratic government, and we Chileans have always taken pride in that fact. During the nineteenth century the Conservative and Liberal parties alternated in power—only those two parties at first, and then in combination with other smaller parties. Among the latter there was the Radical Party, which kept growing until in the last few years it came to constitute the most powerful political party in Chile.

As in other countries in the last century, Chilean politics developed with little concern for social or economic problems. The hardest political battles took place over questions of a religious character; in that struggle the Conservative Party was the champion of the Catholic Church, defending the religious marriage ceremony as the only one necessary for legality (since 1884 religious marriage had no legal validity there), ecclesiastical privileges, the union of Church and State and many other questions which succeeded in arousing our forebears.

During the twentieth century the situation changed and political struggles took place on the terrain of social and economic questions, especially after the formation of the Socialist and Communist Parties, which upheld the doctrines of Karl Marx. In the first years of the '20s Chilean political parties lined up in the following manner: the Right, made up of the Liberal and Conservative Parties, which had forgotten their ancient differences and whose members were for the most part representatives of the rich landowners and included as well a number of students and professional men; the Center, which was held by the Radical Party with tendencies very similar to those of the French Radical-Socialists, that is, more concerned with the secularization of education and the anti-clerical struggle than with social problems; the Left, comprising the Socialist and Communist Parties, the only champions of the rights of the working man.

Since the political parties were lined up in this manner, there was no other way possible than for Chilean Catholics to belong to the Conservative Party, especially when it is realized that the statutes of the Conservative Party expressly stated that the party upheld the doctrines of the Catholic Church (although there were many Catholics among the Liberals who thought that religion was a personal matter which had no bearing on a man's political philosophy). In spite of the Conservative declaration their statutes actually contained clauses which implied a negation of these religious principles and which corresponded politically and socially to the liberal philosophy.

In practice, without ignoring the encyclicals on the social question, the Conservative Party on many questions denied their applicability to conditions in Chile at that time. Thus, for example, it opposed organization of the peasants, attacked the intervention of the State in several major questions where the common well-being required it, and repeatedly opposed several means of attaining social justice on the grounds that they would mean doing away with charity, as if Christian charity alone could care for every need.

In this fashion in the course of the years Chilean Catholics through the Conservative Party came to be the defenders of a régime which had nothing Christian about it, either politically—for it was inspired by the doctrines of Rousseau—or economically or socially—for it defended an extreme capitalistic system which ignored the social teachings of the Church. Confusing order with the status quo, Catholics declared that they were defenders of "Order" and struggled to maintain an anti-Christian system.

To be just, however, it must be acknowledged that the Chilean Conservative Party always showed itself to be more advanced in social matters than the Liberals. Several of the social laws of Chile (which has the most advanced social legislation in South America) were introduced into parliament by the Conservative Party, and within that party there have always been, and there still are, leaders with a sincere social conscience.

A new force then arose in Chile, the National Socialist Movement, a party clearly and unashamedly fascist, which succeeded in making many recruits among the students in the Catholic universities as well as the non-Catholic ones. The origin of this movement was threefold: a reac-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion against the type of politics which held sway in the country, the aspirations of youth for a more modern political system, and the fear aroused by the progress registered by the Socialist and Communist parties, which offered themselves as revolutionaries. It was the time at which the attempt was made to set up the false dilemma of either Communism or Fascism. There was no intermediary solution, it was said. The Chilean Nazis then undertook various battles in the streets with groups of Communist workers.

It was a very dangerous moment, especially if we take into consideration the nazi groups among the students, whose activities have so much political importance in Latin American countries. It was then that the youth of the Conservative Party organized in a more modern form to oppose nazism and at the same time to destroy the idea of the above-mentioned false dilemma which people sought to impose as inevitable. This youth group of the Conservative Party took the name of Falange and attained considerable success in the universities, always within the Conservative Party and supported by its leaders. Since it was a youth movement with greater consciousness of the problems of the moment, it logically assumed an advanced social character based on the positive part of the social teachings of the Church, especially on applying the principles of the great encyclicals, *Rerum Novarum* and *Quadragesimo Anno*.

Then in 1938, in the October presidential elections, the victor was Aguirre Cerda, the candidate of the Popular Front, which was a combination of the Communists, Socialists and Radicals (the latter party having abandoned its former Center position moved to the Left and accepted Marxist principles, even though a large portion of its membership belonged to the wealthy bourgeoisie and even included many rich landowners).

The Right had predicted that the triumph of the Popular Front would bring about a persecution of the Church and during the electoral campaign had emphasized that point. This did not occur, and since 1938, when the present political régime came to power, the Church and the Government act in perfect harmony. Separation of Church and State has been in effect in Chile since 1925, and Catholic private schools continue to receive appropriations from the State and the relations between the Government and the Church are as cordial as they have ever been in the past, or more so.

From its founding, the Falange had friction and differences with the leadership of the Conservative Party; the gulf widened after the advent to power of the Popular Front. For the Conservative Party sought to maintain a bitter and violent attitude toward the new government. Some of the elements of the party together with certain Liberals even cooperated with an absurd *coup* by a group of army men seeking to seize the reins of State. This effort collapsed a few hours after it had broken out. All this brought about a definite break and the complete separation of the Falange from the Conservative Party; since then, with the name of Falange Nacional, it has constituted an independent political party.

Despite its name, which might sound confusing, the National Falange of Chile is a clearly democratic party as it has demonstrated on many occasions, and as can be seen in many of its declarations. One of its leaders, Manuel Garreton, former member of the House and present representative of Chile in Turkey, thus expresses the thought of the Falange: "We accept without question the democratic system of government, that is to say, a political régime in which are fulfilled the following requirements: popular consent as the basis for electing those who comprise the governing power and, as the concrete formula which expresses consent, the widest possible universal suffrage. (2) A system of checks and balances between the powers of the State. (3) A government responsible for its acts." By this last is understood freedom of criticism through free expression by word of mouth or writing, which was guaranteed by the political constitution of Chile.

On the social terrain the Falange accepts neither the marxian nor the liberal interpretation of man and society. On the contrary it poses solutions which derive from Christian philosophy. This does not mean mixing politics with religion but solely giving Christian testimony and seeking to create a new world which corresponds more faithfully to the profound exigencies of the human person. It opposes the present capitalist régime and struggles for a new system which will make social justice assured. It believes that man possesses natural rights prior to the rights of the State, and that they must not only be respected but served by civil society. Among them there are the right of the individual to work and to receive a just wage for his work which will provide the wherewithal to live decently with his family and to educate his children, and the right of private ownership—taking into account the social aspects of ownership and limiting the use of property by the requiremetns of the common good.

★

Actually the Falange has cooperated with the coalition of the parties of the Left which at present governs Chile. One of the Falange's leaders, Eduardo Frei, is Minister of Public Works in the present cabinet. The Falange has not hesitated to collaborate with marxist parties because it believes that despite their political philosophy the practical political objectives of these parties are in accord on many points with the social ideals of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Falange. Furthermore, it believes, as the Falangist leader, Radomiro Tomic, expressed it in the Chamber of Deputies, "That those on the Right and those on the Left in Chile are certainly not identical with those on the Left and those on the Right of Our Heavenly Father." The Falange has always maintained that the struggle between the Right and the Left constitutes a stage in political life which must be outgrown. It is not possible to hold that it is an inevitable struggle between classes with interests which will tend always to be opposed, that marxist principle which, curious as it may seem, many Rightists appear to accept. On the contrary, it is necessary to recognize the solidarity of all men on the national terrain as well as on the international one. That is the only concept which is truly Christian.

We cannot ignore the fact that we are now living in the epoch of the common man and if the workers know of no other solution they will tend to adopt that which marxist doctrine offers them. Is it possible, then, that we Catholics remain inert, fearful of a solution which is better because it answers not only the material necessities but also the spiritual aspirations of man? The opposite policy resulted in the past in what Pius XI called "the great scandal of our time, the loss by the Church of the working masses." The policy of the Falange in seeking this solution has already borne fruit. Thus in districts which are clearly workers' districts such as that of the nitrate mines in which a few years ago there were only the Communist and Socialist parties, the Falange has now come to be the strongest political group, holding the most votes. In the universities the success of the Falange has been even greater, numbering among the students a greater proportion of adherents than the other parties and having completely thrust into oblivion what remained of nazism — almost inexistent since 1938.

In Chile, as in other South American countries, there is a phenomenon which must be taken into account; according to the official census 97 percent of the population declare that they are Catholics, and yet the percentage of people who go to Mass and receive the Sacraments is very small. The reasons for this are various, but one of them, and a very important one, has been the unfortunate confusion between politics and religion in the minds of the workers. For this reason the existence of the Falange has been beneficial for Chile. For many, today the Church of Christ no longer appears in the paradoxical situation of defending the powerful instead of placing herself on the side of the poor and the humble. Many workers now realize that Christian doctrine is on their side when they seek greater social justice.

The identification of the Church with a political party is something which must be avoided at any cost, as the tragedy of the Spanish Civil War so well shows. A hospital chaplain in Chile told me one day of an unforgettable scene in which a dying Spanish refugee refused the Sacraments. "Father," he said, "how can you expect me to believe in a religion whose priests supported those who slaughtered my whole family?" The Spanish poet, Leon Felipe, exiled to Mexico, said in one of his moving poems on the tragedy of Spain, referring to the followers of Franco: "They have robbed us of everything, they have even robbed us of God." I believe that these two instances cannot fail to impress any Catholic. I refer to them not in order to justify the sacrileges permitted by the Spanish republicans, but precisely to prevent occurrences such as these, which all we Christians condemn and regret profoundly. In Chile, thank God, I believe that now they will never come to pass.

The Anatomy of Depression

A powerful myth in American politics dies prematurely

George Doherty

IN THE late thirties the most distinguished American economists developed a new explanation of the economic disaster which had kept from 7 to 13 million men unemployed in the United States in that decade and the national income on the average only about two-thirds of the potential. This was the theory of economic maturity, or stagnation. It was derived from Lord Keynes's epochal book of 1936, "The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money," which posited the relationship of saving (really the effort to save) to investment (or the opportunity to invest) as critical for the level of employment, and the volume of investment as one of the chief determinants of employment. Keynes was and still is the colossus who bestrides the city of economists. His book was a revolution. It did not attempt to account for the American de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pression specifically, but the leading American economists, using Keynesian analytical tools, reached substantial agreement on an explanation which became the theoretical basis of much Roosevelt Administration economic policy. In 1939, administration economists, like Leon Henderson and Lauchlin Currie, arranged an elaborate public début for the stagnation or maturity hypothesis, under congressional sponsorship. The joint Temporary National Economic Committee held hearings in which the theory was propounded and then tested by expert testimony. Economists were put to work writing a series of monographs (more than 40 in all) which for a long time to come is apt to constitute one of the most valuable compilations of descriptive data about the American economy. Many of these monographs were neutral or irrelevant to the central hypothesis, but the total effect of the committee's work seemed to confirm the theory of the mature economy.

When, shortly after, the war lifted the American economy to new peak production levels, economists—like everyone else—settled down to technical work concerned with means and procedures rather than ends and policies, and there was not much time for speculation about the causes of phenomena which could not possibly recur until the war's end. But it is fair to say that nearly all took for granted that at the end of the war the American economy would again be chronically sick—not simply, mind you, subject to violent cyclical instability, but usually, characteristically, underemployed and underproducing.

No such conclusion underlay the New Deal's early, vigorous action in 1933-36. At that time, the depression was viewed simply as a cyclical slump, occasioned partly by money market abuses and partly by temporary overexpansion in certain durable goods industries; it was the government's business to prevent recurrence of the abuses (v. the SEC legislation and the banking reforms) and to shorten the period of slump by means of minimum wage standards and pump-priming governmental expenditures which would stimulate private spending.

Pump-priming deficit spending on the scale authorized by Congress—how modest it seems now—did not in fact send the economy spiraling toward full employment. Certainly this failure to respond encouraged Administration economists to look for deeper, persistent causes of unemployment, which more and more came to seem incurable without Governmental surgery—without structural reforms in the American economy.

The theory they developed is briefly this: The American economy is now mature, in the sense that the rate of population growth has already sharply declined, and will decline further. In this mature economy, people normally want to save more than can be invested. Failure to spend the excess leads to "long and severe depressions, [with only] brief, anemic recoveries"—unless (a) private investment is augmented by vast public works, or (b) savings are reduced and consumption increased by taxing the upper income groups and by measures which increase the incomes of the poor.

As long as the population—and the national territory—were growing rapidly, investment opportunity had kept pace with the urge to save. The growth of population had minimized the risk of new ventures; if a business overbuilt, the market soon caught up with it. This growth—along with the development of virgin territory—required vast capital outlays for housing, transportation, utilities, etc.—larger per capita than those required by a stationary population in a fixed area. The latter requires more personal services which demand less investment. As the economy matures, investment opportunity thus becomes more and more dependent on technological advance. But such advance is sporadic, and rarely takes the form of great new industries, consuming vast amounts of capital. Inventions more and more take a capital-saving, rather than creating, form. Finally, in our day capital requirements are so largely financed from corporate depreciation and depletion allowances that individuals are hard put to find places for *their* savings. The end result of all this is that the economy settles down to an average level of employment low enough so that individuals can find outlets for all their savings.

In 1939, this hypothesis had considerable surface plausibility, particularly in view of the long delay in the cyclical upswing despite protean Governmental stimuli. Economists had little time to prove it in the war years. But it is a sign of the immaturity of economic science that the hypothesis of the mature economy was accepted immediately by the leaders in the field as an established theory, without thorough statistical, technological and logical testing.

Until the publication last July of "The Bogey of Economic Maturity,"[1] no rounded out criticism of this type had appeared. True, a minority of economists had aligned themselves at the wailing wall of economic reaction, where, along with many business men, they cried out against the immorality and the defeatism of the hypothesis, in the name of many dubious absolutes; but the elementary business of checking the logic of the hypothesis and the basic data was just as unessential for most of these dissenters as it was for the American economists who accepted it as proved.

This ought to indicate the value of Terborgh's heresy. He did certain relatively simple things which ought to have been done by the TNEC before anyone ever took the maturity idea seriously.

[1] George Terborgh, Machinery and Allied Products Institute.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He did a thoroughly competent job; his economic craftmanship has always been admired in the profession. While he was on the economic staff of the Federal Reserve Board, he had supplied some original data which the TNEC impressarios had considered most significant for their hypothesis, but he had had no part in the interpretation.

Later, he became chief economist for the Machinery and Allied Products Institute, a group of trade associations, and for some reason which suggests nothing if not ingenuousness "The Bogey of Economic Maturity" was published by them. No one, to my knowledge, has questioned the book because of its sponsor, or suggested that it is, on that account, an *ex parte* analysis. In fact, judging by the reviews, the stagnationists can find little to say in rebuttal. Some of them simply say that the idea of stagnation has really been out of vogue for some time, but the literature does not support this, and even when "maturity" and declining population growth are not directly adverted to, the assumption that the economy is chronically depressed by oversaving persists and dominates. At best, economists have given up untenable premises while retaining their conclusions.

It is well at this point to say briefly how Terborgh demonstrates the shoddiness of the premises. He admits that rapid population increase implies a higher rate of capital formation than is needed when the population is stationary. The yearly increment of population must be supplied with its quota of capital goods; that increment was cut in half from 1850 to 1920. But the record clearly shows that the decline in population growth has had no harmful consequences on production and prosperity, even though investment attributable to population growth has decreased. Relating per capita production data to changes in population in many countries during the past sixty years, Terborgh finds no evidence that countries with high rates of population growth have had any more rapid rise in production than those with slow growth. Nor, for any individual country, have periods of rapid population growth been characterized by relatively great advances in per capita production. Moreover, "For 70 years we experienced a declining rate of population growth . . . with no indication of declining economic health and vigor."

It is the relation of saving to investment which is important, as everyone agrees. In a stable population, Terborgh argues, saving (like investment) tends to be smaller than in a growing one, and a larger fraction of saving is absorbed in financing dissaving, leaving less for new capital formation. Saving tends to be smaller precisely because investment tends to be less, for much saving takes place only because the saver wishes to invest in particular goods (e.g., individuals, saving to buy consumer durable goods, farm equipment and equipment of unincorporated enterprise; corporate withholding of dividends in order to buy new plant). More saving is absorbed in dissaving because there are more people beyond working age, living by liquidating assets. Whereas in 1850 there were in the United States 80 people over 65 years of age for every 1,000 workers, by 1940 there were about 170.

Declining saving and rising dissaving "offer at least a partial explanation of the historic fact that the tapering of demographic growth rates has not been accompanied by the baneful consequences envisaged by the stagnationists."

★

Terborgh points out that the geographic frontier in the United States ended fifty years ago. Why, then, were its harmful effects delayed until the thirties? The first three decades of the twentieth century showed a slightly higher rate of capital formation to national product for the United States than the last three decades of the nineteenth, and we continued to import capital for twenty years after the passing of the frontier. Even after World War I, in 1922-29, our net export of capital was only $450 millions a year, 2 to 3 percent of domestic capital formation. Foreign frontiers, therefore, can hardly be said to have substituted for the vanished American one, even temporarily.

But, he says, apart from this historical test, the stagnationists should have perceived that investment in developing the frontier was largely at the expense of capital formation in the older areas, from which the settlers migrated. In fact, the frontier was relatively poor and invested less per person at the start than was being invested in the older communities. It was the growth of population, not the westward movement, which added to capital formation. To prove this, he compares increases in per capita man-made wealth in frontier (or newly developed) states in 1890-1922 with the same data for older states, and finds the former to have been actually somewhat smaller, i.e., investment opportunity was greatest in the older states.

"The real frontier is technological, not territorial." "The opening up of new territory will be inconsequential compared with the development of areas long settled but technologically primitive."

With respect to the dearth of great new industries in the mature economy, Terborgh argues that (1) the original invention is usually no more important for investment than the thousands of supplemental improvements and innovations which follow it, spread out over a long period, both in the industry and in allied fields: (2) the "great industries" are no more dynamic, investmentwise,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than the aggregate of all lesser innovations; (3) modern technology, using organized research on an increasing scale,[1] can achieve a higher, steadier rate of progress than in the past, and (4) discovery and invention are not nearly so irregular as is the capitalization of inventions.

Statistically, he shows that for fifty years (1870-1920) the combined rate of investment of the three great new industries—steam railroads, electric railways and motor vehicles—rose no faster than capital formation as a whole, and never was more than 20 percent of the total.

He also shows that investment in productive equipment per dollar of output of all commodities increased, as did investment per worker, at a nearly constant rate from 1869 to 1929. There is thus no evidence of an increasing proportion of capital-saving investment.

★

This book is a criticism of one theory and not a defense of any other. It does not, therefore, offer any substitute explanation of the prolonged unemployment of the thirties. Therefore, in turn —and this will be clear to all who respect books and do not cheaply exploit them—it offers small comfort to the idolators of *laissez faire*. Whatever its cause, depression is one of the contemporary Four Horsemen; whatever its cause, government *must* take heroic measures against it. Generally speaking, those measures will have to take the form of maintaining, or increasing, spending power and spending: to an overwhelming extent, unless indeed we socialize, private spending power and private spending.

In view of this, you may wonder what practical effect upon public policy the discrediting of the maturity theory will have. The theory of permanent oversaving implied the necessity to change permanently the distribution of national income and to enlarge permanently the area of public investment. Of these two imperatives, the second was emphasized in the late 30's. Since the number and scale of bridges, schools and highways which Government can build is rather narrowly limited, the permanent expansion of public investment implied appropriation of one or more of the private sectors of the economy—i.e., partial socialization. Housing or public utilities or some other branch of private economic activity would have to be socialized.

While such socialization may eventually be necessary if the private economy fails to provide employment, it certainly should not be advocated on the ground of a theory which is not true. Moreover, there is an obvious and real danger in partial socialization—the danger that it may paralyze or seriously impede activity in private sectors which fear subsequent socialization.[2]

A predominantly private economy such as ours mainly depends for its economic well-being on private expenditures, for investment and consumption alike. Partly the level of these expenditures is governed by the expectations—optimistic or pessimistic—of the spenders: this is particularly true of investment. Partly it is governed by purchasing power: this is particularly true of consumption. The problem, of utmost delicacy, which our economy faced in the thirties and will face again in some postwar year is how to raise—or keep—consumer purchasing power at the full employment level and, at the same time, not alarm private investors, for our economy and even more the world's still needs unprecedented capital expansion.

But consumer purchasing power must be maintained—that is the first need. We know that unemployment will never generate private investment, and there is good reason to believe that a high level of consumer expenditure will generate enormous private investment. George Terborgh shows us that the physical and technological conditions for such investment are now more favorable than ever before; he makes no effort to persuade us to make it a golden calf.

The problem of increasing (or maintaining) consumer spending power will be easier in the future than in the past because Federal Government taxes are now so large that by reducing taxes the Government could, in orderly and efficient fashion, add enormously to spending power. But even this resource can be exhausted, and, of course, its effectiveness depends largely on how the tax burden is distributed. Even with this weapon, therefore, the problem of how effectively to raise consumer spending power is still not solved. Wages are by far the most important element and we have no national wage policy, nor any effective machinery for controlling the general level of wages so that the historical downward spiral of wage rates, hours worked and number employed can be arrested at the start. What methods can we develop to solve the problem of occasional—not chronic or typical—depression by supporting the necessary high level of consumption? We start with little agreement among political leaders or among experts. The Congress cannot even agree to acknowledge, in broad principle, the public responsibility, although every Congressman knows that if the ship is wrecked Government must salvage, at a cost which in waste and disproportion suggests the cost of war.

[1] Expenditures for industrial research before the war had reached a level 3 times 1929 and 12 times 1920.

[2] We shall soon see whether investment in the non-socialized sectors of the British economy will be discouraged by this uncertainty.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Communications

CHICHERIN

Washington, D. C.

TO the Editors: I am interested in what Mr. Max Fischer had to say about George Chicherin and a review of a book I made recently (THE COMMONWEAL, December 28, 1945).

I suppose it may still be possible for two men to have known a third man in quite different ways without necessarily impugning each other's intelligence or veracity. How two men weigh and appreciate the character and acts of a third man is affected almost inevitably by the *manner* in which they have known him, and the formative background of each of the two. If they differ, it doesn't need to mean that either of them is a fool or a phoney.

I notice that Mr. Fischer refers to Chicherin uniformly as "Foreign Commissar Chicherin." Why? Chicherin was somebody in his own right long before he became a Bolshevik Commissar. If one has been around long enough, it is possible to have known Russians as part of the old Imperial Régime, and even socially, as members of a family as well as of a political régime; as "Uncle" or as "Cousin" George. It is possible to have known Russians of that kind and in that way all through their century-old loose revolutionary and evolutionary strivings, and into the hard, tough, close-knit and ruthless Party régime of Lenin and Trotsky.

Certainly, it is true, as Mr. Fischer says, that "Commissar Chicherin" was a gentleman. Certainly, it is true also that literate Russians in all social classes of the Empire read copiously, discussed intimately and practically interminably, through the months-long Russian nights and days, all the authors whom Mr. Fischer cites as evidence that Chicherin had read everything. Nor was it unusual to find in the same person complete reversal of conviction, often repeated, often expanded into something new and different from any preceding conviction, only to be again reversed; and each reversal or new position would always be advanced with all the polemic fire which is one of the Russian national characteristics. Hence, the futility of earlier Russian revolutionary attempts. Hence too, the brutal suppression of expressed thought by the political secret police of every Russian régime. Hence, the liquidation of two of Russia's social classes and the iron indoctrination of the remaining third.

It is equally true that if one knew him that way, and the social class to which he belonged, Chicherin was a bitter, disillusioned cynical man, but he was obsessed stubbornly by one thing; the need to build a powerful Russia, a power Empire in some new form, for, as Mr. Fischer says, "Chicherin believed sincerely in the twilight of capitalism" and in that belief he was far from being alone among generations of intellectual and cultured Russians. It was precisely all that which made Russia's conquest so easy by a compact, determined minority party.

That is what I said. That is what Mr. Fischer also said in his rather annoyed comment upon my review. So what? I can't quite see why he "is forced to doubt Mr. Sands's human insight" and why he implies thereby "doubt that Mr. Sands had personal knowledge of Chicherin." After all, several Americans *have* known several Western Europeans quite well and even several Russians! Maybe the answer to that sort of comment lies merely in an inadvertent contamination by the plain bad manners of a new breed of "authorities" which is growing up among us.

With his increasing disillusioned bitterness and his increasing bad health, Chicherin became increasingly a difficult man to know even in his own narrowing circle. Russian-like, however, he could always expound to a doctrinaire listener particularly if his listener happened to be a doctrinaire liberal.

WILLIAM FRANKLIN SANDS.

BOOKS FOR INDIA

Saint Xavier's, Patna, India.

TO the Editors: Some years ago you published an appeal of mine for copies of your paper and other Catholic periodicals for distribution among non-Catholics in Ceylon. Many of your readers responded to that appeal and your paper was very much appreciated in public reading rooms and by individuals. I left Ceylon some time ago and am now with the American Jesuit Fathers at Saint Xavier's, Patna, India. Here some of us are starting a similar work but on a much larger scale.

People outside the Church in India, particularly in the North, know almost nothing about the Church's solution for the numerous problems of the day. At the same time the educated classes have lost their conservatism and are willing to welcome new ideas. But the new ideas that come to them at present are mostly from the communists.

It was from Patna, the ancient Pataliputra, on the "sacred" Ganges, that in the third century B.C., Asoka, the first Buddhist emperor, sent out his missionaries and spread Buddhism in India, Burma, Ceylon, and Tibet. Now from this very city we propose to send out the printed word of God to the four hundred million inhabitants of this vast sub-continent of India.

May I, then, appeal to your readers to send us as many copies of your paper as they can spare? We need also other Catholic periodicals, books and pamphlets, specially those on current problems.

The Reverend J. STEPHEN NARAYAN.

LONGO

Jersey City, N. J.

TO the Editors: I regret that the haste with which I composed my letter on the Longo case caused me to omit to state categorically that Longo and his lawyers *did know*, before the trial, of the report made to the prosecutor by the handwriting expert. This should convince you that the prosecutor was not the ogre pictured by the "liberals."

You state that "the opinion of the best of Longo's supporters deserves consideration." I would heartily agree with you did the "best of his supporters" know what they were talking about. I have no hesitation in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

saying that 99 percent of these people know practically nothing about the matter. The metropolitan press and the weeklies have certainly done nothing to present a fair and impartial report of the case and I cannot bring myself to believe that they have secured such a full and accurate knowledge by intuition.

I want to emphasize that I bear no animus toward Longo. I think that the position in which he now finds himself is the result of his own momentary imprudence. I would very gladly lend my name to any petition to secure him a pardon.

EUGENE P. KENNY.

The Screen

No Discharge in the War

HOLLYWOOD has various ways of dishing up drama; it would be fun to sit in on the studio conferences that determine the treatment of a story and then later to see the film that came out of these discussions. It would have been particularly interesting to witness the conferences that led to the movies reviewed this week because these pictures are dramas that have similar technical problems (involving more character study than usual) and because the finished products attain such varying degrees of artistic success. After all is said and done at these conferences, it is most likely the director who gets the last word, for on him more than on any one person depends the course of the film. Of course he must have material, at least a plausible script made from a passably good story and actors of some ability; that is why those films on which one man works in the double capacity of producer and director frequently turn out so well. But in any case let us remember when applauding a good movie, that the director, not the star, deserves the major credit.

"A Walk in the Sun" is as good an example of fine motion picture directing as has been seen in a long time. We don't mean to depreciate the excellent acting of its all-male cast or the intelligent script that Robert Rossen wrote from Harry Brown's novel (which has been rated as one of the best of the war stories), but Producer-Director Lewis Milestone has taken all this good material and shaped it into one of the greatest pictures of World War II. Perhaps through its very simplicity and lack of ostentation, it achieves universality as it visualizes an incident that happened long ago, way back in 1943, beside the gentle waters of Mare Nostrum. A platoon lands on Salerno Beach in the darkness just before dawn, takes cover, walks six miles under the morning sun and occasional strafing planes, overcomes its objective and blows up a bridge by noon of the same day. It sounds so easy, but it's not of course.

Nor was it easy to portray this piece of war; for this is no typical Hollywood cross-section of men from all over USA. The types are there, but character is revealed, as it is in life, bit by bit, until at the finale we know these men—individually and as a group, not only those who survive, but the casualties too, for as the sergeant says, "Nobody dies." Some are wounded, some killed and the command changes often. The sergeant, who leads after the lieutenant is killed on the beach, becomes a mental casualty; and then the next sergeant, whose stomach is tied in knots, takes command. At times the picture is static (but by design); we see only what the men see. "The trouble is we never know what's happening," one soldier complains. Through the slowness of Milestone's direction, the suspense becomes terrific. The shivering men in the dark, the wonderful shots of watching faces, the small talk as the men walk in the hot sun, the stillness after a skirmish and the feeling of impending danger, the edgy nerves as it "seems like this war is nothing but waiting," the cocky soldier, the scared soldier, the soldier who knows that in 1958 "we're going to fight the battle of Tibet," the sergeant (formerly a farmer) who desperately longs for an apple and who devotes a moment of pity to the poor Italian soil that's no good because too many soldiers have been walking on it—all these details (plus the engagement with the enemy whom we hardly see at all) add up and make a picture of one more battle in war. The "offstage" singing of a ballad, written by Earl Robinson and Millard Lampell, is meant to serve in a Greek-chorus capacity and give a framework to the whole piece. While I found this device unnecessary and rather arty, I do not think it detracts from the film's sincerity. To Milestone who gave us "All Quiet on the Western Front" after the last war, and to his co-workers, should go unstinted applause for making another film that has a strong anti-war theme in first-rate cinema. "A Walk in the Sun" is like a highly charged capsule of war that epitomizes all war.

It is frequently difficult to understand what determines the choice of material for a movie. I should like to have heard the conferences at which it was decided to buy Ben Ames Williams's novel *"Leave Her to Heaven"* and the later ones that argued about what to do with it. Evidently many issues were left unsettled because the finished movie, though expensively made, is as pointless as any film that has turned up in recent years. With the aid of a good cast and some stunning settings enhanced by technicolor, it tells the story of a completely vicious woman (Gene Tierney) who was so madly in love with her father that she marries a famous author (Cornel Wilde) mainly because he looks like her dead father. Then she proceeds to make everyone thoroughly miserable (or dead) who stands in the way of her sole possession of her husband on her own terms. She entices his crippled brother on a swim, then allows him to drown. She kills her unborn child by throwing herself down a flight of stairs—in, needless to say, one of the most painful scenes ever in a movie. She finally kills herself in such a way that the blame falls on her husband and her cousin (Jeanne Crain) who have by this time become interested in each other. I don't know what the movie is trying to say; and neither did Jo Swerling who based his script on Williams's cheap and sensational book; and neither did John M. Stahl who directed the piece so flatly that it has practically no cinematic movement. It is doubtlessly meant to be a study in character, but since

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the story is practically without meaning and the central figure deviates so far from the norm while the people around her are so colorless, the film is more irritating than shocking. Perhaps the moral of all this is: don't marry a woman who's in love with her father, a jealous woman, a murderous woman. Or perhaps the moral is that every best seller is not grist for the Hollywood mill.

The same applies to Maritta Wolff's *"Whistle Stop,"* which is a study in the seamy side of small town life. Between keeping one eye on the censors and the other on a story that doesn't make sense after being cleaned up, Director Leonide Moguy had a busy time for himself and turned out a pretty dull job. The heroine (Ava Gardner) returning to this hick town after two years of fast life in the city, finds her heart-throb (George Raft) still the cigarette-borrowing bum he was when she left. So she takes up with a shady character (Tom Conway) who runs the local night spot. The sordid tale runs on and on—slowly, torridly. Love, jealousy, frustration, envy, hate and murder find their way into the events at this whistle stop. The portrayal and motivation have little to do with real life—except for an occasional flash as in Victor McLaglen's performance as Raft's dim-witted pal, and Jorja Curtright's display of unhappiness and misfortune. The moral again seems to be: every best seller, no matter how hot in the reading, is is not grist, etc.

While *"Cornered"* is also about a lot of people who are not very nice, it has been handled by film makers who know how to concoct a movie. Its tough, exciting, though unpleasant story is told in good cinema terms. Dick Powell, still the hard-boiled character he was in "Murder, My Sweet," portrays a Canadian out for revenge against the collaborationists who murdered his wife during the German occupation of France. The chase leads to Argentina where fascists and anti-fascists are still slugging it out, and somehow in the mélée, the pursuer becomes the pursued. Edward Dmytryk has directed John Paxton's script to get every ounce of suspense and thrill out of it; he is greatly assisted by excellent lighting effects heightening the scary situations and by an outstanding cast who respond to staging that considers the film as a whole and not as a series of individual performances. Walter Slezak, Morris Carnovsky, Jack LaRue, Steven Ceray, Micheline Cheirel, Luther Adler all portray the international set with whom our tense hero tangles. Powell's realistic portrait of a man sick with fear and accused of being a fanatic without a purpose adds greatly to the film's nervous tension. "Cornered" won't exactly change anyone's thinking on ideological matters, but it does provide entertainment of the thriller variety without treating you like a moron.

PHILIP T. HARTUNG.

The Opera Season

Music in the Air

THE Metropolitan is full of strange caprices. A few Seasons ago, Bach's "Phœbus and Pan" was given in a set that resembled a Masonic Lodge decorated for a shepherd's convention; last year "Coq d'Or" was dramatically detained and musically mongrelized by the insertion of "Scheherazade"; and this season they have revived Puccini's "Il Tabarro." The first two of these contrivances need not bother us now, they mixed their metaphors and departed; but since "Il Tabarro" is with us for a time, a few words about it are probably in order.

"Il Tabarro" can best be described as a misconception, and it is this because it starts with a mistake about the nature of opera and gets no further. Exactly when the idea of geographical veracity started in opera, I cannot say. There is, to be sure, a Spanish dance in Mozart's "Figaro," and "Aïda" has a few irregular spasms of orientalism; but touches of this sort sufficed composers who wanted any local color, while most were content to do without it entirely. If there is anything Spanish in the music of "Don Giovanni," "Fidelio," or "Il Trovatore," for example, I have so far failed to either hear it or miss it. Folk Operas like "The Bartered Bride" are another matter; and even their appeal, for those unafflicted with the *Heimweh* they are associated with, is based on musical qualities that might well have roots anywhere.

Perhaps it was Wagner's efforts to remove what he considered absurdity from opera that started the idea. What saved Wagner was his ability to substitute and maintain his own absurdities for those of the Italian and French schools, and not any step in the direction of veracity at all. Not that he was interested in local color; but the cry for dramatic faithfulness, that one finds throughout the nineteenth century in many, many forms and which his adherents imagined he had for all time fulfilled, was bound, in lesser talents, to fulfill itself in less exacting tasks. In fact, it is precisely Wagner's eschewing of the specific that allowed the epigones a local corner to cultivate for their own. Where he could turn primeval muck into a prima donna (with all the sublime absurdity the image implies), they must needs be saner, more civilized and citified, and attempt to make their modern prima donna more "real."

When Puccini wrote "La Bohème" in 1896, he could create his own musical Paris; but by 1918, when "Il Tabarro" appeared, he attempted to have Paris create his music for him. It didn't. "La Bohème" is a vehicle for singers; "Il Tabarro," like its setting, merely a barge that cannot move on its own power.

The opera is in one act, its plot and setting realistic in the manner of those who believe adultery and ragpickers somehow sacred in the Temple of Truth, its music two-thirds Parisian atmosphere and one-third action and psychology. It reflects, therefore, a number of tendencies in opera belonging to the years immediately preceding it. Psychology and atmosphere had been rescued from Wagner and action purified of ornament. Opera, in other words, was no longer absurd. But it was also, for the most part, no longer opera.

Richard Strauss, a stronger talent working in a richer because frankly more derivative tradition, was able to wrest more from these tendencies than others. It would seem that the ultimate silliness in the sacrifice of talent to dramatic "truth" had been reached in Debussy's

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Pelléas." Being faithful to Maeterlinck's drama is like being married to a scent; but slogans have wonderful ways of perpetuating illusion, and instead of Debussy's work becoming an exposé of the whole imposture, it became an ideal. By now I imagine, though, it has become quite clear that practically nothing new was created by this veracity, and that what was created of any value owed its best qualities to the noble absurdities of what was considered an outworn form. The old artifices were vessels both deeper within and brighter outside than the new. An achievement like "La Traviata" as musical drama is still capable of offering many suggestions to a modern composer of opera.

What Puccini imagined he was up to when he concocted "Il Tabarro," I cannot tell; for his combination of local color, the music in the air, and psychological action, ended by being as static as a wall-map on which thumb-tacks denote far-away movement.

CHESTER KALLMAN.

Heard Melodies

ANNE FREMANTLE

"BROWN hair turning grey, and a face like the face of one of those statues which Gothic sculptors carve—a face of sudden prominences, and deeply shadowed folds and hollows, emphatically rough-hewn so as to be expressive even at a distance." Thus, in his novel about California "Time Must Have a Stop" Mr. Aldous Huxley describes William Propter, ex-historian, present mystic, usually referred to by the other characters, half-affectionately, half-contemptuously, as "the Propter object." This, though the hair is reddish rather than brown, and a pointed beard conceals mouth and chin, may well serve for physical description of Henry Fitzgerald Heard, born Oct. 6, 1889, and better known as Gerald Heard. Like Gaul, Mr. Heard, as writer, is divided into three. He is a more than adequate scientist—he used to be the science expert on the British Broadcasting Corporation—and a writer on scientific subjects. He is also a writer of thrillers—scientific thrillers—under his actual initials, H. F. Heard; and, finally, he is a mystic, writing, still scientifically, as well as historically, about religion and mysticism.

These three activities exercise pretty thoroughly the whole man. For a true scientist is as objective as it is possible for a human being to become: he observes data, and from these he deduces what appear to be consequences, and sometimes assumes that, given again the same causes, the same effects will probably result. The thriller-writer is purely imaginative—pure artist. For him, reality's only function is to give credibility to his story. The mystic, like the scientist, observes, collects data. But above all, he experiments, and the subject of his experimentation is always himself, whilst its object is X—that other reality whose existence he must necessarily postulate if he would prove his own. Objective, subjective, and both simultaneously: Gerald Heard plays his three parts to their capacity.

Mr. Heard has written around twenty books. His first, "Narcissus," an essay on evolution, was published in 1924, his most recent, "The Gospel According to Gamaliel" has just appeared (Harpers, $2.00). Already in "Narcissus," which purports to be the history of clothes, there is adumbrated the whole of Mr. Heard's philosophy, further developed in "The Ascent of Humanity" (1929), "The Emergence of Man" (1932), "The Third Morality" (1936), "Pain, Sex and Time" (1939), "Man, the Master" (1941). In some ways, Mr. Heard seems to take up where Mr. Wells leaves off. A promenade through prehistory is inevitable in all these books. Whether he is discussing clothes or his Creator, he must always begin at the beginning, often with what he calls "The Epoch of Integral Consciousness"—the Eolithic age—which lasted about a million years. Sometimes he begins even earlier, with the first jelly-fish-like forms in which life was when the earth's crust cooled. Anyway, through every deviation and variation, he shows nature always with man in mind. He shows, too, how every other form of life stuck somewhere, accepted the easy, immediate solution: for example, how the whales became all mouth, how the ruminants bartered the embryo hand for a hoof, the birds theirs for a wing; how the snakes lost their limbs in the Eocene period. For each species suffered the temptation: each had the chance to go on, fulfilling a destiny designed for them by someone else, which they lost by their choice of specialization on their own. "As long as there is life, and there will be life, there will be present the temptation to treat the temporal as thought it were the eternal, to refuse to go on." "And with each temptation, and every Fall," what is really significant in any phase is not the manifest, but the latent; those events which seem decisive and characteristic are already spent." Again "all living forms are but variants of one body which expresses the comprehensive will to live."

Yet it is mother-naked man, "the most unspecialised of all creatures, whose supreme requirement is that he be delivered against the manifest insufficiency of himself." And this deliverance cannot be by evolution. "For we can no longer indulge in any vague optimism about 'evolution going on.' It stopped from one to three million years ago." And it is here that, for Mr. Heard, lies the terrible gravity of our situation. "If our evolution is over, if there is no further original outlet for our enormous and fretting energy (with a sexual potential ten times that of a bull) then the only choice is slow degeneracy through sex addiction, or a convulsive end through homicidal mania." This horrid fate, however, can be avoided—if we will. For each person, as for every conglomerate of peoples, there is possible redemption. This redemption can be present, actual and immediate fact: we have only to accept it, and to pay the price.

Why man may thus be redeemed, and the rest of creation never was offered this second chance, Mr. Heard nowhere explains. He recognizes and emphasizes man's unique destiny, but admits neither the orthodox explanation—that it is ours in virtue of our creation in the image of our Creator; nor suggests another. We have sinned,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

he admits, as greatly as the wolves, not biologically but intellectually. Because for so many, individuals or equally nations, the terrible burden of individual consciousness is too much, the tired heads droop and off drops the crown; man the master accepts once more the ersatz; the dictator, be he individual or mob; lust for love, temporal power for eternal sanctity. And whenever man finds what he is looking for, let him beware!

Mr. Heard offers a very interesting possibility for a redemption of the animal world, based on Saint Paul's "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth" etc.: it is that animals may be redeemed *through* their association with man: the arrested wolf has developed into the highly intelligent dog; the little, fox-sized horse has become the noblest of quadrupeds, through their allegiance, their cleaving, to man. Just as man himself, meeked by his Creator, may when tamed and taught, share the divine life.

Quite early Mr. Heard became concerned not only with the possibility for the individual of accepting the increased consciousness that alone he is created to enjoy, but with the further possibility of men training themselves collectively for this acceptance. For some years he was closely connected with the Friends—he is, and always has been, convincedly an extreme pacifist. Both he and Mr. Huxley contributed to a pacifist anthology, published in 1936. Mr. Heard's contribution, "The New Pacifism," based on a lecture delivered at Friends House in London, suggested strenuous spiritual training for prospective pacifists, who would practice meditation in groups of not more than twelve. "All this life," Mr. Heard declared in "A Dialogue in the Desert," "man must be learning to diet himself for another way of living." And elsewhere he states "the goal is that each individual himself enter upon the united consciousness within himself, and that thereby he discover not only his union with all his fellows, but with all life," and he is certain that even dictatorship "cannot sidetrack that, the true evolution of man." Only the individual himself, alas, has the power for that ultimate and final refusal. In his "A Quaker Mutation" a lecture delivered at the Friends College of Pendle Hall, Mr. Heard suggested there should be units for training men, for "meeking" them. The first step is "to learn concentration, to make the mind obey. But the mind will not obey until appetite and sex, tongue and taste, time and diet, sleep and thought, leisure and occupation, all are harnessed."

So, gradually, the idea of forming a permanent association grew. Mr. Heard has always had a following. His two most famous friends, Aldous Huxley, the novelist-philosopher, and Wysten Auden, the poet, stand out amongst many hundreds who have studied with Mr. Heard, and learnt much from him. Already in England, as teacher, lecturer and writer, later here in America, from whatever pulpit he has preached—and he has found truth in Quaker meeting or in Yoga exercise—he has inspired others to follow him. The slight, compelling figure has given to many the impression of a reed played upon, played through; whose words came through, not from, himself. He has always thought of himself as a speaker, not a writer, and many of his more complex ideas are considerably clarified when spoken in a seminar.

Within the last few years Mr. Heard has established at Tzabuco, in one of the loveliest sites of Southern California, near Laguna Beach, what is officially called a college—for an association must have a name. Here are about twenty-five men and women living under Mr. Heard's leadership—already more than twice the twelve he originally had in mind. For three hours daily—Mr. Heard himself puts in six hours—meditation is practiced in a windowless room with many steps, built for this purpose. All the work of the community is done by the members, and life is monastic (silence is kept from sundown until after breakfast, and there are two long seminars given daily by Mr. Heard) and ascetic. Indeed, Mr. Heard has lost several disciples through his insistence on a chastity that excludes also marriage.

"There is evidence," Mr. Heard has written, "that our society is tending to produce, not the orthodox saint, but men who, when the rest of us come up against the limitations of our mental age, when we cease to grow in consciousness, they go on." The production of such people is the objective of Tzabuco.

Thus science has led Mr. Heard, as it led Pasteur and Sir James Jeans and other great scientists, to a "holism" —to borrow General Smuts's term—that finds the old supposed antithesis between science and religion elementary, my dear Watson, and oh, so nineteenth century. He has returned, or has gone forward, to the medieval curriculum; first the quadrivium, which included physics, thence to the trivium, which began with metaphysics. And in so doing, he has piped for many others who have danced.

★

Of his purely mystical books, "Training for the Life of the Spirit," "The Creed of Christ," "The Code of Christ," "Dialogue in the Desert," "a Preface to Prayer," and now "The Gospel according to Gamaliel," all have been published within the last five years. All show a growing preoccupation with the personality, as well as with the teaching of Christ. Mr. Heard, in a "A Dialogue in the Desert" tells us that each generation creates its own Caesar and re-interprets Christ, and it seems these five books are his own personal re-interpretation.

Mr. Propter asks "Why should one choose to go to Athens?" and answers his own question: "Because it's worth the bother, and the same is true of eternity. The experience of timeless good is worth all the trouble it involves. You've read lots of descriptions of the Parthenon. You've read descriptions of timeless good. Dozens of them. But you've never bought your ticket to Athens."

The purpose of "The Creed" and "The Code," as also of "A Preface to Prayer," is to show just how to go about buying that ticket. And Mr. Heard calculates exactly to the last cent what it will cost. Perhaps, he suggests, as Heraclitus did, here we are as in an egg. Perhaps our life of at best 1000 months is for the soul what the 20 minutes in which the chromosomes meet and pair are for the body? For the whole of our earthly life

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does not permit action, but it does permit both being and becoming; for in this life we are only able to play the cards then dealt.

What we become here, in the time of our mortal life gives us, *"nunc et in hora mortis nostrae,"* the hand we shall play eternally. Because, for us "God's mercy is nothing less than God the Creator working upon time, in time," when our "restoration and correction is complete, then Time ceases and whether in the body or out of the body we enter the Eternal." As for the creatures with the shortest time sense, the ephemerae to whom each day is an aeon, so for us, each separate glimpse of consciousness can become completely static, and be as eternal as an instantaneous snapshot.

But if we miss that mercy, and deny it, then we condemn ourselves to hate. If we don't love, we *must* hate. For if man does not attain the ecstasy for which he is created, he will take to self-torture, to pleasure in paining himself, and, of course, others also. All our modern orgy of hatred is simply love reversed, avorted, embittered, soured, gone rancid. And for our agony of resentment, we have no one to thank but ourselves.

In both "The Creed" and "The Code" Mr. Heard deals with the timeless paradox of the immanence and the transcendance of God. As the Upanishads say "He Who is the center of the sun, know thou He is that in the core of thy heart." Yet what man needs above all, as Albertus Magnus said, is above all that he knows, and: "why am I so far from Thee Who art so close to me?" Mr. Heard shows the Beatitudes to be "Code" in no less than three senses: a code of law; a code, or rule, of conduct; a code to be decoded. And shows too, that they are a ladder of seven happinesses set up on the firm platform made ready for them by the five petitions. He accepts our fall, on Eckhardt's three levels: our personal sins, our fallen nature, and time itself, and accepts, gladly grasps indeed, the redemption. But not as a Christian; not through Christ, but through his own soul being directly "meeked, and tamed and trained by God."

Here, perhaps, in Mr. Heard's own personal refusal, is the explanation of much that follows. Our final apotheosis, he has written, is that "we as separate self-seeking will are completely radiated away. We become God. This is not blasphemy. As the soul yields and is transmuted there is heard . . . that eternal creative word 'there is none but God. He alone is all.'" Thus Mr. Heard declares himself a pantheist, which means that he refuses entity, and demands identity. He refuses, in fact, the fact of creation—of his own creation. He will not admit that because he has once been created, he can never be destroyed—even by, or in God, for that destruction would be a denial of the Creator by Himself.

In the "Dialogue in the Desert" Mr. Heard shows Jesus first tempted to prove the Fatherhood of God (not to accept it on faith) by using His power over nature. Of course you can sign God's cheques, you're His Son, aren't you? is, in essence, Satan's argument. But "no stone turns into loaf, no air turns into stair." The second temptation is of course the Temple: that Jesus should take what is His, the power over men's hearts and minds. Not win it, by the Cross, but seize it, as Crown. And the third temptation is to sacrifice the first commandment to the second: to love his neighbor more than God. Jesus rejects this with "there are some things I cannot do even to save my neighbor—I may and must love God and his highest law more than I love even my fellow man." Satan leaves Christ, but the Zealots waylay him, and promise they will undo his work, since he will not further their Jewish nationalism: Iscariot is prophesied as the "Dialogue" ends.

★

Stemming from his own pantheism, from his original refusal to accept Redemption as a gift, preferring to take it as a self-chosen, God-assisted task, Mr. Heard seems to be falling into all three of the temptations he so clearly shows Jesus to have avoided. In his tremendous, life-long and growing interest in psychical research, in his many experiments with, and investigations of the borderland, of other worlds, together with his great and growing delight in the strange, the weird and the phantastical, he seems to be playing at making bread of stones. In his declaring himself a teacher, speaking from pulpits, and acting as "director" to many souls—he writes from 70 to 80 letters a week, many of them letters of direction, and many of them to clergymen—he seems to be accepting the offered Temple: he is already leading a sect, a group, one of the many sprouted by the mystically fertile soil of California, and seems to be, perhaps unconsciously, founding, if not a new religion, then a new, modern, brand of Gnosticism. The Gnostics declared that all Christ taught had an outer and an inner meaning—an obvious meaning for the crowd, an esoteric meaning for the initiates, the elect. In "The Gospel according to Gamaliel" Mr. Heard declares Jesus to have been both Israel and Ismael: Israel when he spoke the Beatitudes, when he healed and fed; Ishmael when he cleansed the Temple, cursed the barren fig-tree or defied the Pharisees. He sees Jesus as an avatar: prophesied by one John, historically present for 33 years, then mystically comprehended by another John, and as deliberately misinterpreted by Paul. Lastly, Mr. Heard seems to be in danger of distorting the truth as it is given —possibly because he "has compassion on the multitude" and thinks they need a gentler doctrine than that given in the Synoptic Gospels.

> "Was Jesus gentle, or did He
> Give any proofs of gentility?"

Blake pertinently asked of Him who came to bring not peace but a sword.

Already in "Man the Master" Mr. Heard had expressed his dislike of the Book of Revelation, calling it a forgery, whose "bitter spirit was utterly alien to pacifism and to the apostle of love or the spirit of the Gospels." Accusing the Church of "gagging with her eye on the door" he says she persecuted the mystics whenever they sought direct experience of timeless good, so that they were obliged "increasingly to interpolate" the name of Jesus in their writings to avoid charges of heresy (forgetting, perhaps, that Bernardine of Siena was de-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nounced to the Pope for his great veneration for that Name and his constant use of It?)

In "A Preface to Prayer" Mr. Heard fiercely attacks the Psalms, and abuses the Church for her attack on Marcion—Marcion who didn't care for the bloodthirsty cloud-enmantled Yahweh and denied He could possibly be God the Father. Mr. Heard also dislikes the mental inadequacy of modern saints—the Curé d'Ars, Bernadette, Thérèse of Lisieux, and implies the Church has no intellects left to canonize. Now, in "The Gospel according to Gamaliel," he attacks Jesus Himself. He started out all right, says Gamaliel "but I saw his teaching harshen and lose the full embrace of its charity as it met the resistance of the timid and the conventional . . . his faith was giving out." The Perennial Philosophy, declares Mr. Heard, was side-tracked by the historical Jesus, still more by His odious disciple Paul.

★

So Mr. Heard, from initial pantheism, through Gnosticism, is come to a terrifying Manichaeism, or dualism. He is not even true to himself in denying to Israel and to the Church what he has postulated of every other form of life: the power of development, of becoming. As man grew, from fish-gilled amoeba to savage Israelite, so the idea of God grew with him. The Psalms are the more, not the less, superb for the human limitations of their writers; we marvel the more at the power of the Holy Ghost when we see the cowardly, gross, selfish peasants whom He transformed at the first Pentecost. Is it not possible that Mr. Heard, in denying to the Kingdom the power of growth, is repeating Marcion's error? For all life is becoming, and neither Israel nor the Church was patterned on Pallas Athene, springing adult from Jove's brain. Mr. Heard, like Mr. Belloc before him, may think it odd of God to choose the Jews, but if he accepts his own premises, as set out in "The Code of Christ," he cannot doubt that God did. In "The Gospel according to Gamaliel" he has fallen into just the kind of specialization he denounced in wolves and whales. In his dislike of marriage, and of the simplicity of some saints, he seems to advocate the procedure followed by Buddha's well-taught Aryan disciple, who "feels disgust for the body, feels disgust for feeling, disgust for perception, for the activities, feels disgust for consciousness. So feeling disgust he is repelled, being repelled, he is freed" (The Pali Canon).

But if Mr. Heard now accepts *that* "way," he must reject the road he has traveled hitherto. Man is intellect, man is mind, it is true, but, as Aquinas pointed out, here we must love more than we can know—only hereafter will our knowledge equal our love. In exaggerating any virtue, we overstep our mark; love only, and prudence, are outside this law. Jesus accepted the body, and blessed and hallowed it, and with water at life's beginning, with oil consecrating all our five senses at the end, the Church has followed His example. Earth, salt, water, oil, bread and wine are the species of sacraments and sacramentals, and, in marriage, the very bodies of the married.

Perhaps Mr. Heard's chief value is as a sign: a sign for this century, which turns to such experiments as Tzabuco, as the third and fourth centuries to the Thebaid, or the thirteenth to find the lady Poverty on the dusty roads. Nature is infinitely resourceful and as infinitely wasteful: it is possible that Mr. Heard's importance is that of an instrument, through which certain melodies have been, and are being, played. But he lacks the humility of Saint Paul, who was afraid lest "having preached to others, I myself become a castaway." Two of Mr. Heard's disciples—Messrs. Huxley and Auden—have already outdistanced him in their spiritual progress; it may be that Mr. Heard's value lies uniquely in the message and the music he has already relayed?

More Books of the Week

Trends in Collective Bargaining. S. T. Williamson and Herbert Harris. Twentieth Century Fund. $2.00.

STUDENTS of industrial relations will welcome this topical summary of recent experience in collective bargaining. For the most part the material is admittedly second-hand, having been distilled from an assortment of authoritative works, such as, for example, Volume 5 of the excellent Millis-Montgomery series, the Twentieth Century Fund's indispensable symposium, "How Collective Bargaining Works," and recent bulletins of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The authors have attempted, with considerable success, to establish certain tentative generalizations on different phases of collective bargaining, generalizations based on the composite findings of the above-mentioned sources and other similar studies. Like all generalizations, of course, theirs are open to question at times, but the authors are to be thanked by busy students for having made a stab at it. Their style is a little more ponderous than Stuart Chase's, but popular enough to attract the general reader. Bibliographical references in the footnotes are complete and the index very extensive.

The concluding section of the book contains the Report and Recommendations of the Twentieth Century Fund's Labor Committee, an eight-man committee made up of representatives of business, labor, the economics profession and the government. The controversial character of the Committee's recommendations can best be indicated by the numerous dissenting footnotes inserted in the text by individual members of the group.

My own feeling is that those recommendations of the committee which are aimed at making trade unions more responsible are less than realistic. The report is opposed to the incorporation of unions as a device to increase their liability, but it recommends "the establishment of federal and state tribunals to enforce fair union practices and to be known perhaps as fair practice boards," and in addition it advocates the establishment of so-called rank-and-file "delegate councils" to develop grass-roots democracy in the labor movement. Professor Witte shrewdly observes in dissent that he doubts "the wisdom of creating machinery duplicating the regular union organization." I fully share his misgivings. Trade-union democracy, like its counterpart in business and political life, is desirable, but it will never be perfected by doctrinaire panaceas.

This is not to criticize the spirit of the Committee's recommendations, for all of them were motivated by the following declaration, the detailed implications of which would fill a small-sized library and, if implemented in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practice, would revolutionize our way of life: "Hence, *over and above the primary prerequisites of successful collective bargaining, to date, namely the recognition that managements and unions are mutually indispensable and functionally equal, must come this new recognition that to serve themselves best they must serve the common prosperity most.*"

GEORGE G. HIGGINS.

For Thee The Best. Mark Aldanov. Scribner's. $2.50.

HOW could it have happened that dissipated, cruel, unbalanced Lord Byron was completely carried away by the idea of Greek liberation? This is at least the most consistent subject in the flimsy composition of this historical novel. With an overdose of psychology and in a macabre mood the author offers some disillusioning glimpses of the political world during the last decade of the poet's life. Byron himself does not become a convincing figure. Most events are not seen through the poet's eyes but cynically enough by a spy first in the Austrian then in the British service—a trivial petty bourgeois with a petty love affair and petty viewpoint. He is an ex-Carbonaro, called through the whole book by his ridiculous masonic name: the Master-of-the-Moon.

In the hands of a great writer it might be a sublime irony to look at tragic historical events after the manner of a Sancho Panza, at once elevated and debased by his somewhat ominous profession of spying for any nation that pays him best. But with Aldanov it falls flat, because there is no philosophy of history in his book and Byron has become too much of a sceptical and split personality to be a character of Quixotic idealisms whom the Master-of-the-Moon might serve as foil.

It is only one minor episode in the book that gives a certain historical and personal atmosphere and may remain for a long time in the mind of the reader: the scene of the two British big shots, the Duke of Wellington and Lord Castlereagh: the dignified old men who hold in their trembling, senile hands the greatest power of their time—and the Duke of Wellington suddenly realizing that his friend, the foreign Secretary is a lunatic. From this moment he has only one thought: nobody in England must know. . . .

MAX FISCHER.

United for Freedom. Edited by Leo R. Ward, C.S.C. Bruce. $2.50.

THIS comprises one of the most satisfactory cases for consumers cooperation yet to appear. It is well documented, presents the argument from enough different angles to sustain interest and builds up a picture of the movement which is remarkably complete considering the size of the volume.

Catholics who have any lingering doubts as to the attitude of leaders in the Church to the cooperative movement will find here plenty to silence their doubts. I do not refer so much to Pope Pius XI's absorbing letter of 1938 to the Bishop of Antigonish—indicative as that is—but to such spirited chapters as the late Virgil Michel's Rural Life paper on Cooperatives and the Liturgical Movement, Leo R. Ward on the "Philosophy and the Spirit of Cooperation," the experiences and hopes of Don Luigi Sturzo and Emerson Hynes on the "Family and Cooperatives." Andrew J. Kress in his two historical chapters on the movement, and Eva J. Ross with her account of Belgian farm cooperatives also supply invaluable evidence of the soundness of the cooperative technique and its relationship to political democracy.

Many well-wishers of the movement should be heartened by the thought that in order to make their influence widely felt it is not necessary for the co-ops to take over any major portion of a nation's economic activity. If in any field they account for as much as 15 percent of the trade, they will materially further the common good. For many commodities that is not an unreachable goal even in the United States. Another encouraging note. If you want to start a city co-op, experience indicates that the very best beginning is a neighborhood party.

EDWARD SKILLIN, JR.

The Art of Newman's Apologia. Walter E. Houghton. Yale. $2.50.

BECAUSE no other study has devoted either as much space or as much critical acumen to the "Apologia" as has this present essay, Mr. Houghton's book should find favor among Newmanites. One feels, indeed, that it can scarcely be otherwise. For within these hundred-odd pages, the author has succeeded in giving, if not a complete evaluation of the Cardinal's autobiography, at least a discerning analysis of the various stylistic and rhetorical devices employed therein. Of especial import is the first part of the treatise which shows convincingly that Newman was not unprepared for his undertaking in 1864, for by that date he had at his disposal quite definite theories of psychology and biography, while all through life he had been blessed with more than ordinary powers of memory and introspection.

If one is intrigued by minute analysis, he will find this study greatly to his liking. To single out but one instance: the graph on page 52 and the remarks that accompany it about the "back-and-forth" movements of the Cardinal's style argue to a high competence in the critic.

That is not to say that the essay is faultless. For one thing, it is more a comment upon special aspects than an examination of the whole of the "Apologia." For another, the historical background to Newman's book is presented inadequately so that there is never gotten a real awareness of the tension under which he worked and which makes his writing so exceptional.

One will agree in the main with the concluding chapters wherein both the truthfulness of the Cardinal and the general accuracy of his self-analysis are maintained. But I do feel that the first of the two discussions is somewhat involved and that in rejecting the charge of F. L. Cross—who contends that Newman has misrepresented his conversion by portraying it as the result of intellectual processes rather than as the product of emotional factors—Mr. Houghton could have saved himself much trouble had he gone to the heart of the matter and shown, from Newman's correspondence in the years prior to 1845, how central was his striving for certitude and how important his tussling with doctrinal difficulties till conversion brought an end to disquietude and he saw himself "coming into port after a rough sea."

HENRY G. J. BECK.

Pursuit of Understanding. Esther Cloudman Dunn. Macmillan. $2.50.

THIS unusual book, by a distinguished Professor of English in Smith College, is the story of an education rather than a conventional autobiography. Intensely personal, it is yet of general interest because it records an experience widely shared and highly valued

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in American society. Consequently we follow Miss Dunn's vivid and sensitive portrayal of her experience with sympathy: grade school and "the alphabetical list of Maine counties . . . Androscoggin, Aroostook . . ."; high school where "the Greek world became alive" thanks to one teacher's "magic"; college and "new personal independence"; then education acquired as a teacher, a brief stay in Wright High, followed by several years in Llangollen College (alias Bryn Mawr) where the deliberately beautiful setting leads Miss Dunn to philosophize on the adequacy or inadequacy of Mark Hopkins's log.

Teaching, then, is followed by more study "Genus; Species; English," for a New Englander to contrast with the home product. All this will please any intelligent reader; the literary, the artistic and the philosophical will delight further in Miss Dunn's appreciation of beauty, in her search for the inner meaning of things and in her continued response to "the timelessness that is in the greatest thoughts and feelings of man as expressed in the arts."

The present reviewer, sharing some of Miss Dunn's experiences, is naturally sympathetic, but is nevertheless inclined to wonder whether the serious self-evaluation Miss Dunn ascribes to college students has not become less common as college experience has become more common; whether such self-evaluation may not rather be the experience of the philosophical and intellectual young person in college or not, or of the relatively privileged in the American educational world who are students in institutions possessing a serious intellectual tradition—institutions critics might place in the ivory tower rather than in the marketplace of our educational structure. Miss Dunn's experiences fit fairly definitely into the ivory tower category and may be criticised as such. Paradoxically in this legitimate criticism, lies, apart from its literary value, the book's current worth. Appearing as it does in the midst of the present examination of conscience in American education, amid conflicting and complementary plans for imparting our cultural heritage more adequately to all sorts of students, Miss Dunn's book serves as a reminder of the vital connection between the scholarly pattern of life and all serious intellectual achievement—as a reminder of the debt of the marketplace to the ivory tower in the pursuit of understanding.

FRANCES S. CHILDS.

Beach Red. Peter Bowman. Random. $2.50.

THIS book is so economical, so poignant and so moving an account of a Pacific island landing, that it seems almost a pity Mr. Bowman has confused his readers with a device which—if they are in the faintest degree sensitive to metre—will set them continually trying to scan, when they should be just enjoying the cadences of the quite excellent prose. Good prose never needs to pretend it is poetry, and the only excuse for printing it poetically is when, as is the case of the King James Bible, the actual words are so well known that the reader can make the necessary adjustments in his memory, not in the reading or visualizing part of his brain.

This is a small cavil at Mr. Bowman for a minor defect in the appearance of his really superb pavane for a defunct private. Yet it worries one the way a lovely girl does when she wears shoddy costume jewelry, instead of, say, Mr. Colder's twisted bits of copper or tin.

Else there is only praise.

"Oh, well,—take off your instincts and make yourself comfortable
and stretch your body out in the quiet, cool grass
and watch the hill balance the sky on its breast
staring into the emptiness and space of its empty spaces.

It's all as good as that—action as well as emotion recollected in a tranquillity that for its author must have been both pillar and cloud. A. F.

The Glass Crutch. The Biographical Novel of William Wynne Wister. Jim Bishop. Doubleday. $2.50.

"IT IS difficult not to squirm under the close scrutiny of the reader," says William Wynne Wister in the epilogue. And he says truly. "The Glass Crutch" tells in vivid and unrelenting detail the life of a man born to some degree of wealth and responsibility. It records the devotion of the family, the wholly unselfish (or was it?) love of his mother; the slavish obedience to his every demand of the family servant; describes his young manhood, his introduction to vice and debauchery; his first and succeeding bouts of drunkenness, each in turn with its pattern of self-flagellance; and his increasing dependence upon liquor whenever he was brought face to face with responsibility.

Every social worker, every clergyman, every doctor and every nurse can testify to the horror that drunkenness brings not only to the drinker but to everyone connected with him; the frantic effort to hide this scarifying, festering sore, to keep the children from knowing; somehow to keep the bills paid and always and forever to try to bolster the moral courage of the afflicted so that perhaps this time he really will "swear off" and make it stick.

Perhaps the most important point in the whole recital occurs quite near the beginning of the book when the small boy who was to have been kept very still, following an operation, fretted and was picked up and cradled by his devoted nursemaid. "There were sewn the seeds of Bill Wister's alcoholism." Small Bill was never taught either personal responsibility, personal integrity or to accept the results of his lack of self-control. He knew that he could coax anything out of his mother, that his father was not adamant and that together they would spare him the results of crime, large or small.

In his epilogue Mr. Wister says that while he has laid all these facts before the reader for the purpose of "helping those afflicted with alcoholism . . . but my hope is far greater." He goes on to point out that "an alcoholic is an alcoholic before he ever takes a drink. . . . The alcoholic is emotionally unable to meet life's frustrations because he was constantly shielded from them early in life. He was never made to earn his mother's adoration. He is unable to make sacrifices for others because he was made to feel that sacrifices were to be made by others for him." And the same patterns attend all his early experience. "A child's behavior patern is set in the first six years of his life. During the years from six to twelve his early attitude grows more set with each succeeding year."

To follow this young man through his first experiences of debauchery; his first patterning of adulation for unearned deeds; his constant strutting for approval and his first fine efforts to master his disease under the tutelage of an excellent psychologist produces a curious reaction. A profound distaste for the weakness of this individual (one has known so many prototypes), a growing wish

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Many Live and Die

. . . in the midst of plenty, spending cheerfully for many things. Yet during their whole life they seem unmindful of the claims of the missions on their charity. Our Lord said, to us all, "Teach all nations!" There are still over a thousand million pagans to be taught, and some sixty million pagans here in the United States, if reports are correct. You will wish to be prompt in doing your part to fulfill that great command. It will help if you are generous to the Catholic Medical Mission Board, whose work it is to help all the missions medically, here and in the fields afar. At 10 West 17th St., New York 11, N. Y., your offering will be gratefully received and used to good purpose.

ANNHURST COLLEGE
R. F. D. 2, Putnam, Connecticut
Accredited College, Conducted by the Sisters of the Holy Ghost
Liberal Arts, Music, Natural and Social Sciences, Pre-Medical, Teacher Training, Preparation for Social Service, Secretarial.
Address: THE DEAN.

SCHOOL OF SACRED THEOLOGY
for Sisters and Lay-women
SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE, NOTRE DAME
Holy Cross, Indiana
Prerequisites: A degree of Bachelor of Arts
A reading knowledge of Latin

IMMACULATA JUNIOR COLLEGE
Washington, D. C.
An accredited Catholic Institution for Women. Sisters of Providence of St. Mary-of-the-Woods. Resident and Day Students. 2 year transfer course in Liberal Arts. Terminal courses in Home Crafts, Secretarial Sciences, General, Fine Arts.
SEMINARY—Four Year College Preparatory
Dunblane Hall—Grades 1 to 8. Address: The Secretary.

SOCIAL SERVICE
WANTED: Trained case workers and working supervisor. Agency is expanding its family and child welfare services. Good supervision and adequate salary based on training and experience. Transportation paid to San Francisco. Write Catholic Social Service, 995 Market St., San Francisco 3.

that somehow this man may achieve manhood in and within himself not for himself but for all the others who will read and learn that despite the faults of their upbringing there is always within the individual the possibility of taking himself by the back of his own neck and pulling himself out.

Will Wister grows up, marries and begets two sons, is divorced and goes through a long series of incarcerations in jails, asylums and hospitals; he emerges, his family pays and pays, and finally after disaster has crowned disaster William Wynne Wister, a thoughtful, tested, sincere man, emerges to say with every force that experience has given him: "There are no short cuts. The illness of the Alcoholic has been long in the making. It will take time to undo. The next ten years will see a great change in the public attitude toward alcoholism . . . when the public understands the causes of such invalidism and how very easily it may be prevented, then parents will make an especial effort to control their very natural tendency to protect children from the hurts and disappointments of growing up." "The Glass Crutch" is a rewarding book. Preëminently it does not spare the reader the agony the writer lived through. And beyond all that here is an interesting story of human lives and loves and patterns.

MARGARET CHRISTIE.

What the Informed Citizen Needs to Know. Edited by Bruce Bliven and A. G. Mezerik. Duell. $3.00.

THERE IS a very simple answer to the question expressed in the title of this anthology of public opinion. Any citizen reading this book will be forced to the conclusion that the nation is faced with a bewildering set of big problems. Moreover, he will have some idea what the problems are in a vague, general way. Beyond this it is difficult to see how, without the very closest reading, he will be able to learn how to go about meeting these problems—full employment, economic planning, international relations, public health, etc., etc. Only one of the selections really goes about setting forth a problem clearly and then proceeds to outline the necessary steps required for its solution. The presentation may be over-simple, but the contrast between James G. Patton's essay on the "Family-Size Farm" and the other comments by leading national authorities should be painful indeed for the bulk of the authors included in this book. Some of the most valuable material in this volume is found in the appendices. They include the actual texts of such important documents as the United Nations Charter, the Atlantic Charter, the report on the Crimea Conference, the official summary of Bretton Woods, the G.I. Bill of Rights, etc., etc. So all in all it is a rather handy tome to have around.

CONTRIBUTORS

Alfonso SANTA CRUX is a Chilean lawyer here in the United States on a fellowship of the Institute of International Education.
George DOHERTY has for several years been in government service—with the Federal Reserve Board and the Foreign Economic Administration.
Anne FREMANTLE is an English resident of New York, N. Y., who is at present at work on several new anthologies.
Rev. George G. HIGGINS teaches at the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.
Max FISCHER is a former German newspaperman now engaged in journalistic work in New York, N. Y.
Rev. Henry G. J. BECK teaches at Immaculate Conception Seminary of Darlington, N. J.
Frances S. CHILDS is a member of the faculty of Brooklyn College.
Margaret CHRISTIE is engaged in literary work in New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED